



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

truce was not concluded in 1602 (p. 50). Sixteenth, read seventeenth century (p. 53). The minutes of the meetings of the Messrs. XVII., said by the author never to have been kept, fill many rows in the archives at the Hague (p. 67). "Maryken Meu" means Aunt not "Mother" Mary (p. 124). Affray, read Affry (p. 154). 1751 is wrong (p. 155). Guelen, read Quelen (p. 209). The picture gallery sold by King William III. in 1850 had been formed entirely by his father, and has nothing to do with the pictures in possession of the House of Orange before 1795, which had in the revolutionary times become the property of the French and Batavian nations (p. 292). The estates thought of fleeing to Haarlem, read Amsterdam (p. 394). No violence to the defeated party !!! No shootings (it is true) by the government, but lootings, by the mob, innumerable (p. 395). One million guilders to France as the price of Liberty and Equality would have been a mere trifle. It was a hundred! (p. 401). "They lost their language" is misleading; the Dutch were governed in French, but never ceased for a moment to speak their own tongue (p. 405). The revolution of 1813 cannot be said to have been the work of "a few families". It was certainly no very heroic affair, the Dutch people being in the position to profit by the victories of others; but as far as it went, the movement was sustained by the nation as a whole and a large number of its most conspicuous supporters were regenerated Patriots from the middle classes (p. 405).

This will not be Mr. van Loon's last work, I presume; may the next one keep the promise now held out, and be exempt from this little *manque de tenue*.

H. T. COLENBRANDER.

Source Problems on the French Revolution. By FRED MORROW FLING, Ph.D., and HELENE DRESSER FLING, M.A. [Harper's Parallel Source Problems.] (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1913. Pp. xiii, 339.)

PROFESSOR FLING's long and earnest advocacy of laboratory work in history renders it eminently fitting that he should be the author of this volume in the series so auspiciously inaugurated by the publication of *Parallel Source Problems in Mediaeval History* by Duncalf and Krey in 1912. The work contains studies on the Oath of the Tennis Court, the Royal Session of June 23, 1789, the Insurrection of October 5 and 6, 1789, and the Flight of the King, June 20, 1791. Each problem is introduced by a short sketch giving the setting, a survey of the sources, a list of questions bringing out the steps in the process of determining the truth and formulating it into a constructive narrative, and finally the sources upon which the students' work is based. Besides this, there is by way of appendix an excellent illustration of the method as applied to "the Tennis Court Oath".

In discussing a work of this kind, which as the author suggests marks a step in the evolution of history teaching, one naturally asks how far

it maintains the standard a manual for laboratory work in college history should have. Thus it is a question whether it is fair to the student to make no mention of the important fact that the sources here given are not all we have on the respective topics. His knowledge of this might, it is true, disturb his satisfaction in the finality of the results of his exercises, but that would be chastening. Again it is a question whether such a source book should not be developed with greater care so as to illustrate more varied problems in historical criticism and construction. The work should be progressive in regard both to the character and the difficulty of the problems to be solved. Instead there is too much sameness; the last is too much like the first. Even the familiar problem of contradictory evidence does not arise in any large sense. The choice of topics is likewise open to criticism because they are not sufficiently representative on the one hand and not well distributed on the other. Of the four, three fall in the first six months of the Revolution, while the fourth, the Flight of the King, is an episodic event in 1791.

The translations are good and often very happy. Not infrequently, however, the effort to be true to the original is too conscientious and stiffness or even obscurity results. Thus on page 30 we find "Groups asking one another reciprocally what should be done", while on page 22, "Bureau of Verification" might be better rendered Committee on Credentials. More disconcerting are the frequent omissions of clauses, sentences, and paragraphs without anything to indicate the excisions from the original source. On page 179, line 5, for example, four lines of the text of the *procès-verbal* are cut out from the heart of the sentence. For similar liberties see pages 38, 177, 178, 180, *et passim*. The fact that as a rule omissions are indicated makes these liberties all the more reprehensible.

The historic settings for the problems are illuminating and suggestive, save that they have a tendency at times to become too meaty, with the result that clearness and accuracy are sacrificed. As an illustration of this the following sentence on the position of the king after the return from Varennes will suffice: "Deprived of his power, placed under guard in the Tuileries, he was for nearly three months a silent spectator of the activities of the first French republic."

But these are minor, though unexpected, defects in a work of unusual usefulness. The peculiar merit of this volume over other collections of sources lies in the fact that it makes accessible material for intensive critical study by presenting a group of sources on the same historic questions. That many teachers will have their classes work out all four problems is not likely. Nevertheless if only one or two are done the exercise cannot but develop a more critical habit of mind and acquaint the student with the rudiments at least of the scientific method as applied to history.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.